



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/540,394	09/01/2005	Eiji Sunahara	Q101062	4910
23373 7590 03/26/2010				
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC				
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.				
SUITE 800				
WASHINGTON, DC 20037				
EXAMINER				
DUFFY, BRADLEY				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1643				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/26/2010		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sughrue@sughrue.com  
PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM  
USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/540,394	SUNAHARA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	BRADLEY DUFFY	1643	

**All Participants:**

(1) Brad Duffy.

(2) William Simmons.

**Date of Interview:** 18 March 2010

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_.

**Time:** \_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

na

**Claims discussed:**

na

**Prior art documents discussed:**

na

**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*After consulting with Primary Examiner Rawlings, the Examiner contacted Applicant's representative, William Simmons regarding a sequence discrepancy between SEQ ID NO:1 and GenBank accession number XM\_044533. During the discussion it was agreed that a sequence letter outlining the discrepancy would be mailed to Applicant for further consideration.*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)